



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/735,407

12/12/2003

Jane Smith Parker

030496; 190250-1720

2094

38823 7590 11/23/2009

AT&T Legal Department - TKHR

Attn: Patent Docketing

One AT&T Way

Room 2A-207

Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER

PARKER, BRANDI P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/23/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/735,407	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PARKER, JANE SMITH	
	<b>Examiner</b> BRANDI P. PARKER	<b>Art Unit</b> 3624	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Acknowledgements***

1. The following is a Final Office action in response to communications filed on 7/13/2009. Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 are pending. Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 22 have been amended. Claims 9, 19, 21 and 30 are cancelled.

### ***Response to Applicant's Amendments***

2. Applicant's amendment to claim(s) 1, 11 and 22, filed on 7/13/2009, has been fully considered and is persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 under 35 USC § 101 has been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's amendment to claim(s) 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31, filed on 7/13/2009, has been fully considered and is persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 under 35 USC § 112 based on rationale in the previous rejection has been withdrawn.

### ***Response to Applicant's Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3624

5. In response to Applicant's traversal of Examiner's conclusion that "it is old and well known in the art to transmit vacation or leave approvals to an employee through email", located on page 18 of Applicant's remarks, Examiner would like to direct Applicant's attention to page 3 of the August 31, 2001 article Simplify time-off approval with our sample policy and request form, by John Connell, where employees receive an e-mail confirmation when a manager approves a vacation or leave request.

([http://articles.techrepublic.com.com/5100-10878\\_11-1061051.html](http://articles.techrepublic.com.com/5100-10878_11-1061051.html)).

This supporting evidence was also included on page 3, paragraph 5 of the Non-final Office Action dated 4/15/2009.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, 22-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claims 1, 11 and 22 were amended to include "wherein the workload metric is based ***at least in part*** upon data related to whether past workload estimates were accepted". Further clarification is needed regarding determining

Art Unit: 3624

what parts in its entirety are needed to determine a workload metric. Thus, claims 1, 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

9. Claims 2-8, 11-18, 20, 23-29 and 31 are rejected for being dependent upon rejected claims 1, 11 and 22 respectively.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green (US 6192346) and Leamon (US 6970829), in further view of Zahir Azami et al (US 2004/0005041).

12. With respect to **claims 1, 11 and 22**, Green teaches Logic stored on a computer readable medium that when executed causes a computer to perform a vacation processing system, the logic comprising:

a. logic configured to provide a vacation eligibility criteria based on at least a first rule (column/line 4/63-5/11, Figure 6); and

Art Unit: 3624

- b. logic configured to process the vacation request of a first employee based on the workload estimate and the vacation eligibility criteria (column/line 4/52-5/34) comprising:
- c. logic configured to receive the vacation request of the first employee (column/line 6/17-21);
- d. logic configured to deny the vacation request due to a lack of vacation availability at a time of the vacation request (column/line 6/3-12); and
- e. logic configured to grant the vacation request due to a vacation availability at a time after the vacation request was denied (column/line 6/17-21).

Green does not explicitly teach providing a workload statistic used to operate a call center. However, Leamon teaches

- f. logic configured to provide a workload estimate comprising at least a first workload statistic that is used to operate a first call center (column/line 5/40-47)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system in Green with the disclosure in Leamon since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of

Art Unit: 3624

ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Green in view of Leamon does not explicitly teach wherein the workload metric is based at least in part upon data related to whether past workload estimates were accepted. However, Zahir Azami teaches wherein the workload metric is based at least in part upon data related to whether past workload estimates were accepted (paragraph 0168, regarding accepting the estimated workload by the managing call processing unit).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system described by Green in view of Leamon with the ability to teach a workload metric that is based at least in part upon data related to whether past workload estimates were accepted as described in Zahir Azami since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

13. As to **claims 2, 12 and 23**, Leamon teaches wherein the first workload statistic comprises an estimated volume of telephone calls that the first call center is expected to handle over a first period of time (column/line 1/48-51).

Art Unit: 3624

14. Regarding **claims 3, 13 and 24**, Leamon teaches wherein the first workload statistic comprises an estimated volume of telephone calls that the first call center is expected to handle over a first period of time, and wherein the estimated volume of telephone calls is derived from historical call volume data obtained from a communications switch (column/line 19/26-34).

15. With respect to **claims 4, 14 and 25**, Green teaches wherein the first workload statistic comprises an expected number of operators needed to operate the first call center during a first period of time (column/line 4/21-28, 4/34-37).

16. As to **claims 5, 15 and 26** Leamon teaches wherein the first workload statistic is derived from telephone call data stored in a database of a communications switch that routes incoming calls or place the calls in a queue. (column/line 1/48-51, 3/12-18, 19/26-34). Although Leamon does not explicitly teach storing call data in the database of a POTS switch, Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to substitute a communication switch with a queuing system for a POTS switch because the call center operators' telephone lines can be connected to speed the call transfer process.

1. Regarding **claims 6, 16 and 27**, Green teaches system of claim 1, wherein the first rule is derived from an employment grade of the first employee, and wherein the employment grade comprises at least one of a payscale and a length of service of the first employee (Figure 5, item 96; column/line 5/56-65) .



Art Unit: 3624

2. With respect to **claims 7, 17 and 28**, Leamon teaches wherein the workload estimate is provided to the first call center in a timely basis, the timely basis comprising at least one of an hourly basis, a daily basis, a weekly basis, a monthly basis, a quarterly basis, a semi-annual basis, and an annual basis (column/line 4/38-44).

3. As to **claims 8, 18 and 29**, Green teaches the system of claim 7, wherein the vacation eligibility criteria is provided in a timely basis, the timely basis comprising at least one of an hourly basis, a daily basis, a weekly basis, a monthly basis, a quarterly basis, a semi-annual basis, and an annual basis (Figure 4, column/line 4/63-5/4).

4. As to **claims 10, 20 and 31**, Green teaches wherein granting the vacation request comprises providing a summary of the available vacation days. Although Green does not teach transmitting an e-mail to send notification of the approval of the vacation request, Leamon teaches a call contact center with the capability to conduct transactions through email (column/line 4/22-28). Furthermore, it is old and well known in the art to transmit vacation or leave approvals to an employee through email.

### ***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

Art Unit: 3624

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDI P. PARKER whose telephone number is (571) 272-9796. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. 8-5pm.

20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley B. Bayat can be reached on (571) 272-6704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

Art Unit: 3624

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRANDI P PARKER/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

/Bradley B Bayat/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624